

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

NYLA F. POTTER et al.,

Plaintiffs,

v.

CLEAR RECON CORP. et al,

Defendants.

CASE NO. 2:24-cv-01173-LK

ORDER STAYING BRIEFING
DEADLINES ON MOTION FOR
LEAVE TO AMEND

This matter comes before the Court on the parties' stipulated motion seeking an order extending the briefing schedule and re-noting the Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint, Dkt No. 47. Dkt. No. 53.

On August 26, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint. Dkt. 47. That motion currently has a noting date of September 19, 2025. Dkt. No. 50. On August 29, 2025, Plaintiffs filed an Amended Motion for Leave to File Second Amended Complaint. Dkt. No. 48. The Court struck this amended motion as untimely via a minute order entered on the same day. Dkt. No. 50.

1 On September 2, 2025, Plaintiffs filed a Motion for Relief from Deadline, seeking a
2 retroactive extension of the August 26, 2025 deadline to file an amended complaint. Dkt. No. 51.
3 That motion has a noting date of September 19, 2025. *Id.* Separately, the parties filed the stipulated
4 motion currently before the Court, seeking an order extending the briefing schedule and re-noting
5 Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint, Dkt No. 47, pending the
6 Court's resolution of Plaintiffs' Motion for Relief from Deadline, Dkt. No. 51. Dkt. No. 53. The
7 parties ask that Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint, Dkt No. 47, be
8 re-noted for October 3, 2025. Dkt. No. 53 at 3.

9 The Court agrees with the parties that proceeding with the current briefing schedule would
10 be inefficient, as the Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint, Dkt No. 47, could
11 become moot pending resolution of Plaintiffs' Motion for Relief from Deadline, Dkt. No. 51. The
12 parties represent that an extension "will not cause prejudice to any party, nor will it impact any
13 other case deadlines," Dkt. No. 53 at 2, and the Court agrees. The Court also finds that granting
14 relief will conserve judicial resources and prevent needless litigation expenses for all parties. *Id.*
15 However, the Court finds that it would be more efficient to stay the current briefing schedule rather
16 than extend it.¹ This will better conserve judicial resources and prevent needless litigation on a
17 motion that could become moot.

18 Accordingly, the Court GRANTS IN PART the parties' joint stipulated motion. Dkt. No.
19 53. The Court ORDERS that the briefing schedule for Plaintiffs' Motion for Leave to File a Second
20 Amended Complaint, Dkt No. 47, be STAYED pending resolution of Plaintiffs' Motion for Relief

21 //

22 //

23
24 ¹ "[T]he power to stay proceedings is incidental to the power inherent in every court to control the disposition of the causes on its docket with economy of time and effort for itself, for counsel, and for litigants." *Landis v. N. Am. Co.*, 299 U.S. 248, 254 (1936).

1 from Deadline, Dkt. No. 51. If the Court grants that motion, it will issue a new briefing schedule
2 on the Amended Motion for Leave to File a Second Amended Complaint.

3 Dated this 3rd day of September, 2025.

4 

5 Lauren King
6 United States District Judge
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24